arXiv:1402.1818v1 [math.DS] 8 Feb 2014

ON INFINITE TRANSFORMATIONS WITH MAXIMAL CONTROL OF ERGODIC TWO-FOLD PRODUCT POWERS

TERRENCE M. ADAMS AND CESAR E. SILVA

Abstract. We study the rich behavior of ergodicity and conservativity of Cartesian products of infinite measure preserving transformations. A class of transformations is constructed such that for any subset $R \subset \mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1)$ there exists T in this class such that $T^p \times T^q$ is ergodic if and only if $\frac{p}{q} \in R$. This contrasts with the finite measure preserving case where $T^p \times T^q$ is ergodic for all nonzero p and q if and only if $T \times T$ is ergodic. We also show that our class is rich in the behavior of conservative products.

For each positive integer k, a family of rank-one infinite measure preserving transformations is constructed which have ergodic index k, but infinite conservative index.

1. Introduction

We consider measure spaces that are standard Borel spaces $(X, \mathcal{S}, \mu)$ with a nonatomic σ-finite Borel measure μ. A transformation is a measurable map $T : X \to X$. We assume all our transformations are invertible mod μ. T is measure preserving if $\mu(T^{-1}A) = \mu(A)$ for every measurable set A. The transformation T is conservative if for all sets of positive measure A there exists a positive integer n such that $\mu(T^{-n}A \cap A) > 0$, and it is ergodic if whenever a measurable set A satisfies $T^{-1}A = A \bmod \mu$, then $\mu(A) = 0$ or $\mu(X \setminus A) = 0$. Since we assume our measures are nonatomic and the transformations are invertible, ergodicity implies conservativity.

An infinite (or finite) measure-preserving transformation T is weakly mixing if for every ergodic finite measure-preserving transformation S, the transformation $T \times S$ is ergodic. When T is finite measure-preserving, if it is weakly mixing, then $T \times T$ is ergodic. As was shown

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37A25; Secondary 28D05.
Key words and phrases. Ergodic index, Rank-One transformations.

by Aaronson, Lin, and Weiss [ALW79] this is no longer the case in infinite measure. Furthermore, Kakutani and Parry [KP63] had proved earlier that there exist infinite measure-preserving transformations such that $T \times T$ is ergodic but $T \times T \times T$ is not; such a transformation is said to have **ergodic index** 2, and similarly one defines **ergodic index** k. They also constructed infinite measure-preserving transformations T where all finite Cartesian products of T are ergodic (these transformations are said to have to have **infinite ergodic index**). A transformation T is defined to be **power weakly mixing** if all its finite Cartesian products of nonzero powers are ergodic, [DGMS99]. Friedman and the authors proved in [AFS01] that there exist infinite ergodic index (infinite measure-preserving) transformations such that $T \times T^2$ is not ergodic (in fact, not conservative), so in particular not power weakly mixing. It is now known that each of these notions is different and that there are counterexamples in rank-one. In fact, there exist counterexamples for actions of more general groups; the reader may refer to the surveys [Dan08], [DS09] for actions of countable Abelian groups and to [IKS$^+$05], [DP11] for flows. More recently, the authors in [JA13] investigate sets of conservative directions for $\mathbb{Z}^d (d > 1)$, infinite measure-preserving actions, while we are only focused on integer actions.

In this paper we continue the study of the unusual behavior of ergodicity of Cartesian products in the case of infinite measure-preserving transformations. All of our examples are rank-one and obtained by the technique of "cutting and stacking." In the first part of the paper, we define a family of rank-one infinite measure preserving transformations such that for each subset $R \subset \mathbb{Q}_0^1 = \mathbb{Q} \cap (0, 1)$, there exists a transformation T in the family such that $T^p \times T^q$ is ergodic if and only if $\frac{p}{q} \in R$. ($\mathbb{Q}$ represents the set of rationals in the real line.) We also show that given any subsets $R_1 \subset R_2 \subset \mathbb{Q}_0^1$, there exists T in this family such that $T^p \times T^q$ is conservative ergodic for $\frac{p}{q} \in R_1$, $T^p \times T^q$ is conservative, but not ergodic for $\frac{p}{q} \in R_2 \setminus R_1$, and $T^p \times T^q$ is not conservative for $\frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus R_2$.

Milnor's notion of directional dynamics for $\mathbb{Z}^d$ actions can be applied in a similar manner to this setting. See [JA13] for a complete definition. We say T is $(r, 2)$-conservative if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $(p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ in the ε-strip around the line through the origin of slope r such that $T^p \times T^q$ is conservative. The results of this paper show for any subset $R_1 \subset \mathbb{Q}_0^1$ of rational directions, there is a rank-one infinite measure preserving transformation T such that T is $(\frac{p}{q}, 2)$-conservative, if and only if $\frac{p}{q} \in R_1$. In this paper, we do not consider the case of irrational directions.

In the last section, we construct infinite measure-preserving transformations with ergodic index $k \in \mathbb{N}$, but with **infinite conservative index** (i.e., conservative k-fold Cartesian product for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$). As in the paper by Kakutani and Parry [KP63], the ergodicity of the Cartesian products of the transformations constructed here can be characterized by the convergence or divergence of a special series. However our transformations have zero Krengel entropy and are of a different nature than those constructed in Kakutani and Parry [KP63] and [ALW79], as those transformations are infinite Markov shifts that are ergodic whenever they are conservative.

2. Two-fold Products

We construct our examples using the method of cutting and stacking. We are able to restrict to the situation where we cut each column into four subcolumns of equal width and place a variable amount of spacers on the subcolumns. Since we make only four cuts at each stage, all of our transformations will be $\frac{1}{4}$-rigid. Thus, all Cartesian products of T with itself will be conservative [AFS97, Corollary 1.4]. (A rank-one transformation whose two-fold Cartesian product is not conservative was constructed in [AFS01].) When verifying that a transformation is conservative ergodic, we will show the equivalent property that for all sets A and B of positive measure, there is an integer $n > 0$ such that $\mu(T^n A \cap B) > 0$.

Before we prove our main result concerning this family, we will give three results which relate the placement of spacers to the ergodicity

or conservativity of the Cartesian products. Since $T^p \times T^q$ is ergodic precisely when $T^q \times T^p$ is ergodic, the results extend to the set $\mathbb{Q} \cap (0, \infty) \setminus \{1\}$.

2.1. **Constructions.** We first recall the class of rank-one transformations constructed by Friedman and the authors in [AFS01]. Let a_n, b_n, c_n and d_n be sequences of positive integers. We inductively define a sequence of columns $\{G_n\}$. Set G_0 to consist of the unit interval of height $H_0 = 1$. Assuming that G_n is a column of height H_n, form G_{n+1} by cutting G_n into four subcolumns of equal width and placing a_n, b_n, c_n and d_n spacers on the first, second, third and fourth subcolumns, respectively, and then stacking the subcolumns from left to right. Then this defines a Lebesgue measure-preserving transformation on a subset of $\mathbb{R}$. Figure 1 represents G_n. Define $p_n = H_n + a_n$, $\ell_n = H_n + b_n$, $q_n = H_n + c_n$, $m_n = H_n + d_n$ and $h_{n+1} = p_n + \ell_n + q_n + H_n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote the transformation by $T = T_v$ where $v = \{(p_n, \ell_n, q_n, m_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be the set of $v = \{(p_n, \ell_n, q_n, m_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfying

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{p_n}{h_n} = \infty,$$

and ℓ_n and m_n are chosen so that

$$\ell_n > n\ (p_n + q_n + 2h_n)$$

and

$$m_n > n\ (p_n + q_n + H_n + \ell_n) = n\ h_{n+1}.$$

Define $\mathcal{V} = \{v \in \mathcal{W} : p_n \leq q_n\}$. Much of our attention will focus on transformations T_v such that $v \in \mathcal{V}$. In this case, we still have freedom to choose the ratio $\frac{p_n}{q_n}$ as any rational in $(0, 1)$.

We recall the following theorem proved in [AFS01].

Theorem 2.1 ([AFS01])**.** *Let $T = T_v$ with $v = \{(p_n, \ell_n, q_n, m_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \in \mathcal{W}$. Then T has infinite conservative index. If furthermore $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : |q_n - 2p_n| < 3h_n\}$ is finite, then $T \times T^2$ is not conservative and T is not 2-recurrent. If in addition $a_n = 3h_n$ and $c_n = a_n + 1$, then T has infinite ergodic index.*



FIGURE 1. Column G_n

2.2. **Ergodicity and conservativity of two-fold products.**

Theorem 2.2. *Let p, q be natural numbers, and $T = T_v$ with $v = \{(p_n, \ell_n, q_n, m_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \in \mathcal{W}$. If for each $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \frac{q_n + \ell}{q} = \frac{p_n + k}{p} \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

is infinite, then $T^p \times T^q$ and $T^{-p} \times T^q$ are conservative ergodic.

Proof. Let E_1 and F_1 each be subsets with positive measure in the product space. Choose levels A, B, C and D in G_N for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mu \times \mu(E_1 \cap (A \times B)) > \frac{31}{32}\mu(A)\mu(B)$$

$$\mu \times \mu(F_1 \cap (C \times D)) > \frac{31}{32}\mu(C)\mu(D).$$

Set $E = E_1 \cap (A \times B)$ and $F = F_1 \cap (C \times D)$. Let k and k' be integers such that $C = T^k A$ and $D = T^{k'} B$. We may assume both k and k' are nonnegative by choosing a larger N if needed. Choose $n \geq N$ such that

$$\frac{q_n + k'}{q} = \frac{p_n + k}{p} = t_n$$

is a positive integer. Let A_n denote the part of A which appears in the first subcolumn of G_n, and let B_n denote the part of B which appears in the third subcolumn of G_n. Then we have

$$T^{t_n p} A_n = T^{p_n + k} A_n \subset C$$

and

$$T^{t_n q} B_n = T^{q_n + k'} B_n \subset D.$$

Since $\mu(A_n) = \mu(B_n) = \frac{1}{4}\mu(A)$, then

$$\mu \times \mu((T^p \times T^q)^{t_n}(A \times B) \cap (C \times D)) \geq \frac{1}{16}\mu(C)\mu(D).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu \times \mu((T^p \times T^q)^{t_n}(E) \cap F) &\geq \mu \times \mu((T^p \times T^q)^{t_n}(A \times B) \cap (C \times D)) \\
&\quad - \mu \times \mu(A \times B \setminus E) - \mu \times \mu(C \times D \setminus F) \\
&> \frac{1}{16}\mu(C)\mu(D) - \frac{1}{32}\mu(A)\mu(B) - \frac{1}{32}\mu(C)\mu(D) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

showing that $T^p \times T^q$ is conservative ergodic.

For the case of $T^{-p} \times T^q$, let k and k' be positive integers such that $C = T^{-k}A$ and $D = T^{k'}B$. As in the previous case, we may assume both k and k' are nonnegative by choosing a larger N if needed. Let A_n denote the part of A which appears in the second subcolumn of G_n, and let B_n denote the part of B which appears in the third subcolumn of G_n. Then we have

$$T^{-t_n p} A_n = T^{-p_n - k} A_n \subset C$$

and

$$T^{t_n q} B_n = T^{q_n + k'} B_n \subset D.$$

A similar argument as before now shows that $T^{-p} \times T^q$ is conservative ergodic. □

The previous proof may be applied to the special case where $F_1 = E_1$, $C = A$, $D = B$ and $k = k'$. Thus we get the following sufficient condition implying $T^p \times T^q$ is conservative.

Corollary 2.3. *Let p, q be natural numbers, and $T = T_v$ with $v = \{(p_n, \ell_n, q_n, m_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \in \mathcal{W}$. If the set,*

$$\{n \in \mathbb{N} : \frac{q_n}{q} = \frac{p_n}{p} \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

is infinite, then $T^p \times T^q$ and $T^{-p} \times T^q$ are conservative.

Now we consider the case when the products are not conservative.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $p \neq q$ be natural numbers, and let $T = T_v$ with $v = \{(p_n, \ell_n, q_n, m_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in $\mathcal{V}$. If $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : |pq_n - qp_n| \leq (p+q)h_n\}$ is finite, then $T^p \times T^q$ is not conservative.*

Proof. Since $T^p \times T^q$ is isomorphic to $T^q \times T^p$, it suffices to prove the theorem assuming $p < q$. Choose N such that $N > q$, $\frac{N-1}{N} > \frac{p}{q}$ and $|pq_n - qp_n| > (p+q)h_n$ for all $n > N$. We may also assume $p_n > 2h_n$ for $n > N$. Let A be the bottom level of G_{N+1}. Define

$$\Lambda = \{i \in \mathbb{N} : \mu \times \mu((T^p \times T^q)^i (A \times A) \cap (A \times A)) > 0\}$$

and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$\Lambda_n = \Lambda \cap (0, \frac{1}{q} H_n).$$

We will prove inductively on n that $\Lambda_n = \emptyset$. This is true for $n = 1, \ldots, N$ since $\mu(T^i A \cap A) = 0$ for $1 \leq i < H_N$.

Suppose that our assertion holds for $\Lambda_n, n > N$. We wish to verify that $\Lambda_{n+1} = \emptyset$. Let D_n denote the union of the bottom h_n levels in G_n. The set A is contained in D_n for all $n > N$. Let $D_{n,r}$, for $r \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, denote the part of D_n in the r^{th} subcolumn of G_n. Below we give a table showing the integers j, $0 < j < \frac{1}{q} H_{n+1}$ such that $T^j D_{n,r_1} \cap D_{n,r_2} \neq \emptyset$.

j	$D_{n,1}$	$D_{n,2}$	$D_{n,3}$	$D_{n,4}$
$T^j D_{n,1}$	0	$p_n - h_n$	$p_n + \ell_n - h_n$	$p_n + \ell_n + q_n - h_n$
	h_n	$p_n + h_n$	$p_n + \ell_n + h_n$	$p_n + \ell_n + q_n + h_n$
$T^j D_{n,2}$		0	$\ell_n - h_n$	$\ell_n + q_n - h_n$
		h_n	$\ell_n + h_n$	$\ell_n + q_n + h_n$
$T^j D_{n,3}$			0	$q_n - h_n$
			h_n	$q_n + h_n$
$T^j D_{n,4}$				0
				h_n

We will show there is no simultaneous intersection for ip and iq among the 10 intervals listed. Let $K_{s,t}$ denote the interval in the s^{th} row and t^{th} column in the table; for example $K_{2,3}$ is the interval $(\ell_n - h_n, \ell_n + h_n)$. To obtain the sets of intersection for T^p, divide the endpoints of the intervals in the table by p. To obtain the sets of intersection for T^q, then divide the endpoints of the intervals by q.

First note that

$$\frac{1}{q}H_n > \frac{1}{n-1}m_{n-1} > h_n.$$

Therefore, by the inductive hypothesis, we may exclude the interval $(0, h_n]$, since there cannot be simultaneous intersection on this interval with any other interval in the table.

We next observe that ℓ_n was chosen so that

$$\frac{p_n + h_n}{p} < \frac{\ell_n - h_n}{np} < \frac{\ell_n - h_n}{q}.$$

This means that $\frac{1}{p}K_{1,2} < \frac{1}{q}K_{2,3}$. Therefore there is no positive integer i such that $ip \in K_{1,2}$ and $iq \in K_{2,3}$. As $p < q$, we also obtain $\frac{1}{q}K_{1,2} < \frac{1}{p}K_{2,3}$, showing it cannot happen that $iq \in K_{1,2}$ and $ip \in K_{2,3}$. Furthermore, we note that the left endpoint of each of the other intervals with ℓ_n: $K_{1,3}, K_{1,4}, K_{2,4}$ is to the right of the left endpoint of $K_{2,3}$, showing similar inequalities for $K_{1,2}$ and these other intervals. Similarly we have that

$$\frac{q_n + h_n}{p} < \frac{\ell_n - h_n}{np} < \frac{\ell_n - h_n}{q}.$$

This means $\frac{1}{p}K_{3,4} < \frac{1}{q}K_{2,3}$, and by the same argument as above it follows that there is no intersection of $K_{3,4}$ with the other intervals with ℓ_n. Thus, it only remains to compare the intervals with ℓ_n as a summand in the endpoints to other intervals with ℓ_n.

Now, ℓ_n and n are sufficiently large so that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{p_n + \ell_n + q_n + h_n}{q} &< \frac{(n-1)(p_n + \ell_n + q_n + h_n)}{np} \\ &< \frac{p_n + \ell_n + q_n + h_n - \frac{1}{n}\ell_n}{p} \\ &< \frac{\ell_n - h_n}{p},\end{aligned}$$

thus $\frac{1}{q}K_{1,4} < \frac{1}{p}K_{2,3}$. As we are comparing the worst case, this also shows

$$\frac{1}{q}K_{1,3} < \frac{1}{p}K_{2,3}, \text{ and } \frac{1}{q}K_{2,4} < \frac{1}{p}K_{2,3},$$
$$\frac{1}{q}K_{1,4} < \frac{1}{p}K_{1,3}, \text{ and } \frac{1}{q}K_{1,4} < \frac{1}{p}K_{2,4}.$$

Thus there is no positive integer i such that iq is in $K_{1,4}$, $K_{1,3}$ or $K_{2,4}$, when ip is in $K_{2,3}$, and such that ip is in $K_{1,3}$ or $K_{2,4}$ when iq is in $K_{1,4}$. Since $K_{2,3} < K_{1,4}$ and $p < q$ it cannot happen that $iq \in K_{1,4}$ and $ip \in K_{2,3}$. Also, as $q_n \geq p_n > 2h_n$ it follows that $K_{1,3} < K_{1,4}, K_{2,4} < K_{1,4}$ and $K_{2,3} < K_{1,3}, K_{2,3} < K_{2,4}$, showing that the cases above are all the ones we need to consider.

For the last part, we consider the case of simultaneous intersection on $K_{1,2}$ and $K_{3,4}$ (this argument will also cover the case of intersection on $K_{1,3}$ and $K_{2,4}$).

By the hypothesis,

$$\left|\frac{q_n}{q} - \frac{p_n}{p}\right| > \frac{h_n}{q} + \frac{h_n}{p}.$$

Thus the distance between the centers of $\frac{1}{p}K_{1,2}$ and $\frac{1}{q}K_{3,4}$ is greater than the sum of their radii, showing there cannot be an intersection among these intervals. Also, the distance between the centers of $\frac{1}{q}K_{1,2}$ and $\frac{1}{p}K_{3,4}$ is

$$\left|\frac{q_n}{p} - \frac{p_n}{q}\right| > \left|\frac{q_n}{q} - \frac{p_n}{p}\right| > \frac{h_n}{q} + \frac{h_n}{p},$$

also greater than the sum of their radii, so by there same argument there is no intersection in this case either. Finally, we note that the intervals $K_{1,3}$ and $K_{2,4}$ have the same radii as $K_{1,2}$ and $K_{3,4}$, and the difference between their centers is the same as the difference between the centers of $K_{1,2}$ and $K_{3,4}$, thus the same argument as above applies to them, showing no intersection. This completes the proof under the assumption that $p < q$. □

Remark: (1). Many of the technical details involving the choice of ℓ_n and m_n are not important. Since one has freedom in choosing ℓ_n and m_n independently of the choice of p_n and q_n, then one may narrow the

cases down to the case where block $D_{n,1}$ returns to block $D_{n,2}$ under T^p and block $D_{n,3}$ returns to block $D_{n,4}$ under T^q. In this case, the choice of p_n and q_n become important. (2). In all these constructions it is always the case that $T \times T^{-1}$ is conservative as $\{a_n\}$ is a partial rigidity sequence for both T and T^{-1}, so their product is conservative by [AFS97].

Theorem 2.5. *Let p, q be natural numbers, and $T = T_v$ with $v = \{(p_n, \ell_n, q_n, m_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in $\mathcal{V}$. If $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : |pq_n - qp_n| = 0\}$ is infinite and $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : 0 \neq |pq_n - qp_n| \leq (p+q)h_n\}$ is finite, then $T^p \times T^q$ is conservative and not ergodic.*

Proof. Conservativity of the product follows from Corollary 2.3. Assume $p \leq q$. A similar argument to the one of Theorem 2.4 shows that $T^p \times T^q$ is not ergodic. In this case, let

$$\Lambda = \{i \in \mathbb{N} : \mu \times \mu((T^p \times T^q)^i (A \times A) \cap (TA \times A)) > 0\}.$$

Then it can be shown that $\Lambda = \emptyset$. The argument above shows that the only simultaneous return times that occur for the blocks $D_{n,r}$ under T^p and $D_{n,s}$ under T^q are when $r = s$. But, when $p \leq q$, these blocks overlap perfectly; hence Λ is empty. □

2.3. **Corollaries.** First we note that it follows from the proof of Theorems 2.4 and 2.5 that there is a set of positive measure A such that for all integers $i \neq 0$, $\mu \times \mu((T^{pi}A \times T^{qi}A) \cap (A \times A) = 0$. Therefore for all integers $i \neq 0$, $\mu(T^{pi}A \cap T^{qi}A \cap A) = 0$. In particular, T is not multiply recurrent.

A corollary of Theorem 2.5 is that if $p \leq q$ and $\frac{p}{q}$ is not in the closure of $\{\frac{p_n}{q_n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then $T^p \times T^q$ is not ergodic. Without much effort this may be strengthened to say that if $\frac{p}{q}$ is not an accumulation point of $\{\frac{p_n}{q_n} : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, then $T^p \times T^q$ is not ergodic. Let $F_N = \{\frac{p_n}{q_n} : n \geq N\}$ and let $\bar{F_N}$ be the closure of F_N. Let

$$F = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bar{F_N} \subset \bar{F_1}.$$

Thus we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.6. *If $p \leq q$ and $\frac{p}{q} \notin F$, then $T^p \times T^q$ is not ergodic.*

Proof: If $\frac{p}{q} \notin F$, then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\{n : |\frac{p_n}{q_n} - \frac{p}{q}| \leq \epsilon\}$ is finite. Hence $\{n : |qp_n - pq_n| \leq \epsilon q q_n\}$ is finite. Since $\frac{q_n}{h_n} \to \infty$, then $\{n : |qp_n - pq_n| \leq (p+q)h_n\}$ is finite.□

The condition in Theorem 2.5 actually says that $\frac{p}{q}$ must be well approximated by $\frac{p_n}{q_n}$, in a certain sense, for $T^p \times T^q$ to be ergodic. With some extra care we may construct sequences p_n and q_n so that each point $\frac{p}{q}$ in $(0,1)$ satisfies either the condition in Theorem 2.2 or the condition in Theorem 2.5.

Corollary 2.7. *For each subset R of $\mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1)$, there exists an infinite measure-preserving transformation T such that, for $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$, where $p < q$, $T^p \times T^q$ is ergodic if and only if $\frac{p}{q} \in R$.*

Proof. Order both R and $S = (\mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1)) \setminus R$ as $R = \{r_1, r_2, \cdots\}$ and $S = \{s_1, s_2, \cdots\}$. Partition the natural numbers

$$\mathbb{N} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} N(i)$$

so that each $N(i)$ is infinite. Let $k : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $\ell : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ be onto maps such that

$$\{j \in \mathbb{N} : k(j) = k, \ell(j) = \ell\} \text{ is infinite for each pair } k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let

$$N(i) = \{n(i,1) < n(i,2) < \cdots\}.$$

For $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $n_j = n(i,j)$, and write $r_i = \frac{p}{q}$ in reduced form. Let

$$\delta_{i,j} = \min\{|r_i - s_u| : 1 \leq u \leq i + j\}.$$

Choose p_{n_j} and q_{n_j} such that

$$\frac{q_{n_j} + \ell(j)}{jq} = \frac{p_{n_j} + k(j)}{jp}$$

are both integers and such that

$$q_{n_j}\delta_{i,j} > 2h_{n_j} + k(j) + \ell(j).$$

By Theorem 2.2, since $k(j)$ and $\ell(j)$ give all pairs of natural numbers for infinitely many j, then $T^p \times T^q$ is ergodic.

Suppose now $s_v = \frac{p}{q} \notin R$ for some v. Let

$$\bar{n} = \max\{n(i,j) : 1 \leq i + j \leq v\}.$$

For $n = n(i,j) > \bar{n}$, then

$$q_{n_j}\delta_{i,j} > 2h_{n_j} + k(j) + \ell(j)$$

where $\delta_{i,j} \leq |r_i - s_v|$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |p_n - q_n s_v| &\geq |q_n r_i - q_n s_v| - |p_n - q_n r_i| \\ &\geq q_n\delta_{i,j} - (k(j) + \ell(j)) \\ &> 2h_n \geq (s_v + 1)h_n. \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for all $n > \bar{n}$, then by Theorem 2.5, $T^p \times T^q$ is not ergodic. □

Let p and q be natural numbers and let $r = \frac{p}{q}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda &= \{n \in \mathbb{N} : |pq_n - qp_n| \leq (p+q)h_n\} \\ &= \{n \in \mathbb{N} : |rq_n - p_n| \leq (1+r)h_n\} \end{aligned}$$

and let

$$\Lambda_0 = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : rq_n - p_n = 0, \quad \frac{q_n}{q} \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Sequences p_n and q_n may be chosen so that $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda$ is infinite. In this case, $T^p \times T^q$ will be conservative, but not ergodic. Thus we obtain the following corollary whose proof is similar to Corollary 2.7.

Corollary 2.8. *If $R_1 \subset R_2 \subset \mathbb{Q} \cap (0,1)$, then there exists an infinite Lebesgue measure-preserving transformation T such that $T^p \times T^q$ is conservative ergodic for $\frac{p}{q} \in R_1$, $T^p \times T^q$ is conservative, but not ergodic for $\frac{p}{q} \in R_2 \setminus R_1$, and $T^p \times T^q$ is not conservative for $\frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q}_0^1 \setminus R_2$.*

3. Ergodic Index

We construct zero entropy transformations such that their ergodic index is determined by the convergence or divergence of a special series. As in Kakutani and Parry [KP63], the ergodicity will depend on the divergence of a type of p-series where the terms being summed are explicit parameters in the construction of the transformations. However, all of the transformations constructed are partially rigid and hence have infinite conservative index. The constructions in [KP63] are such that when the product is not ergodic it is not conservative.

3.1. **Constructions.** We construct a family of rank-one transformations which we classify by ergodic index. Let L be a positive integer and let

$$V_L = \{(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_L) : u_1 < u_2 < \cdots < u_L \text{ and } u_d \in \mathbb{N} \text{ for } 1 \leq d \leq L\}.$$

We wish to define a sequence of vectors such that each vector v in V_L appears in our sequence along an arithmetic progression. First we list our countable set $V_L = \{v_j : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Now we define our sequence $s : \mathbb{N} \to V_L$ by

$$s(2^{j-1} + i2^j) = v_j$$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$ and $i = 0, 1, \ldots$. Finally we are ready to construct our rank-one transformations.

Let $r_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ be a nondecreasing sequence of positive integers satisfying $r_n > L$ for $n > 0$. Begin with column $C_1 = [0, 1)$. To obtain C_{n+1}: first denote $s(n) = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_L)$ and let $\sigma = u_1 + \cdots + u_L$. Cut column C_n of height h_n into r_n subcolumns of equal width, and number the subcolumns from 1 to r_n, going from left to right. Place $h_n + u_d$ spacers on the $(r_n - L - 1 + d)$ subcolumn for $1 \leq d \leq L$ and place $(2L + 1)h_n + \sigma$ spacers on the i^{th} subcolumn for $1 \leq i \leq r_n - L - 1$. Then stack each subcolumn onto the adjacent left subcolumn to form a column of height $g_n = r_n h_n + (r_n - L - 1)((2L + 1)h_n + \sigma) + (Lh_n + \sigma)$. Finally place g_n spacers on top to form the column C_{n+1} of height $h_{n+1} = 2g_n$. Let V_L^* be the family of all Lebesgue measure preserving transformations constructed in this manner.

3.2. **Ergodic Index Characterization.** We give a criterion equivalent to the transformation $T \in V_L^*$ having an ergodic k-fold product. Let $X = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} C_n$ and μ be Lebesgue measure on X. Given a set $I \subset X$ of finite measure, let μ_I denote the measure μ conditioned on I. In particular, $\mu_I(J) = \mu(J \cap I)/\mu(I)$. Let μ^k denote the k-fold product measure on X^k. For a subset $A \subset X^k$ of finite measure, let μ_A^k be μ^k conditioned on A.

Theorem 3.1. *Let k and L be positive integers such that $1 < k \leq L$. A transformation $T \in V_L$ has an ergodic k-fold product if and only if*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{r_i}\right)^k = \infty.$$

If we let r_n be a sequence of positive integers such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{r_i})^k = \infty \text{ but } \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{r_i})^{k+1} < \infty,$$

then the theorem implies that T has ergodic index k.

Corollary 3.2. *There exist rank-one transformations with ergodic index k for any positive integer k.*

Proof of "if": Now we set out to prove if $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\frac{1}{r_i})^k = \infty$, then the k-fold product of T is ergodic. First we state the Independence Lemma which follows directly from the construction. The Independence Lemma coupled with the Borel-Cantelli Lemma imply that a product of levels sweeps out another product of levels. Second we pair iterates to show that certain key iterates mix simultaneously with arbitrary measurable sets. This is accomplished in our Double Mixing Lemma. Finally we apply this in our Bumping Application to show that any set E of positive measure "bumps" any set F of positive measure.

Given the column C_n, number the levels from top to bottom from 1 to h_n respectively. Now we are ready to state the Independence Lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *(Independence Lemma) Let n be a postive integer. Suppose I and J are levels in C_n. Let vector $v_j = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_L)$ satisfy $u_L < h_n$. Define the following sequence,*

$$t(i) = 2h_\ell$$

where

$$\ell = \ell(i) = 2^{j-1} + (i+n)2^j.$$

Thus the sets $T^{-t(i)}J$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are independent with respect to μ_I. Moreover, the sets $T^{t(i)}I$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are independent with respect to μ_J.

The next lemma utilizes independence to obtain a single "mixing time". Our technique is a spinoff of the Blum-Hansen method found in Friedman [Fri83]. Then we prove the Double Mixing Lemma which is sufficient to give us the Bumping Application and complete our proof of "if".

Lemma 3.4. *(Mixing Lemma) Let (X, γ) be a probability space. Let $E_i \subset X$ be a sequence of pairwise independent sets satisfying*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \gamma(E_i) = \infty.$$

Given any set $E \subset X$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer i such that $\gamma(E \cap E_i) > (\gamma(E) - \varepsilon)\gamma(E_i)$.

Proof: By squaring the integrand and applying independence, we get the following,

$$\int (\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\mathcal{X}_{E_i} - \gamma(E_i)))^2 d\gamma = \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\gamma(E_i)(1-\gamma(E_i)) < \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\gamma(E_i).$$

The Cauchy-Schwartz inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned}|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\gamma(E \cap E_i) - \gamma(E)\gamma(E_i))| &= |\int_E (\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\mathcal{X}_{E_i} - \gamma(E_i)))d\gamma| \\ &< \frac{1}{N}\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\gamma(E_i)}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus for $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\gamma(E \cap E_i) - \gamma(E)\gamma(E_i))}{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\gamma(E_i)} < \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\gamma(E_i)}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\gamma(E_i)} \to 0$$

as $N \to \infty$, since $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\gamma(E_i) = \infty$. □

In our examples, $\gamma = \mu_A^k$ and $E_i = A \cap T_k^{-t(i)}B$ where A and B are products of levels, and T_k is the k-fold Cartesian product of T. The following lemma applies to μ_A^k, $A \cap T_k^{-t(i)}B$, and $\nu = \mu_B^k$ and $F_i = T_k^{t(i)}A \cap B$.

Lemma 3.5. *(Double Mixing Lemma) Let (X, γ) and (Y, ν) be probability spaces. Suppose $(E_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset X$ and $(F_i)_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset Y$ are each a sequence*

of pairwise independent sets such that $\gamma(E_i) = \nu(F_i)$ *and* $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \gamma(E_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \nu(F_i) = \infty$. *Then given sets* $E \subset X$ *and* $F \subset Y$ *and* $\varepsilon > 0$, *there exists a positive integer* i *such that both* $\gamma(E \cap E_i) > (\gamma(E) - \varepsilon)\gamma(E_i)$ *and* $\nu(F \cap F_i) > (\nu(F) - \varepsilon)\nu(F_i)$.

Proof: Let $\Lambda = \{i : \gamma(E \cap E_i) > (\gamma(E) - \varepsilon)\gamma(E_i)\}$. The Mixing Lemma implies that

$$\sum_{i \in \Lambda} \nu(F_i) = \sum_{i \in \Lambda} \gamma(E_i) = \infty.$$

Therefore by applying the Mixing Lemma once again we get that there exists $i \in \Lambda$ such that $\nu(F \cap F_i) > (\nu(F) - \varepsilon)\nu(F_i)$. $\square$

Bumping Application: The transformation T_k is ergodic.

Proof: Let E and F be sets of positive measure in the k-fold product space. Choose a positive integer n and levels $A_1, \ldots, A_k, B_1, \ldots, B_k$ in C_n so that

$$\mu^k(E \cap (A_1 \times \cdots \times A_k)) > \frac{3}{4} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mu(A_i)$$

and

$$\mu^k(F \cap (B_1 \times \cdots \times B_k)) > \frac{3}{4} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mu(B_i).$$

By choosing a larger n if necessary, we may assume A_i appears above B_i in C_n. Choose the vector $v_j = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_L)$ satisfying both $u_L < h_n$ and for each $p \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $u_d =$(position of A_p) $-$ (position of B_p). As in Lemma 3.3, let $t(i) = 2h_\ell$ where $\ell = \ell(i) = 2^{j-1} + (i+n)2^j$. The Independence Lemma implies for each p, $A_p \cap T_k^{-t(i)} B_p$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are independent with respect to μ_{A_p}. Thus $E_i = A \cap T_k^{-t(i)} B$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are independent with respect to μ_A^k. Similarly $F_i = B \cap T_k^{t(i)} A$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$ are independent with respect to μ_B^k. Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (1/r_{\ell(i)})^k = \infty,$$

then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_A^k(E_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_B^k(F_i) = \infty.$$

Therefore by the Double Mixing Lemma with $\gamma = \mu_A^k$, $\nu = \mu_B^k$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{4}$, there exists a positive integer i such that both $\mu_A^k(E \cap E_i) > \frac{1}{2}\mu_A^k(E_i)$ and $\mu_B^k(F \cap F_i) > \frac{1}{2}\mu_B^k(F_i)$. Hence $\mu^k(T^{t(i)}E \cap F) > 0$. $\square$

Proof of "only if": Choose $n \geq 2$ so that

$$\sum_{i=n}^{\infty} \left(\frac{L+1}{r_i}\right)^k < 1.$$

For $1 \leq i \leq h_n$ let I_i denote the i^{th} level of C_n from top to bottom. For $m \geq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq r_m$, let $C_{m,j}$ be th j^{th} subcolumn of C_m. Denote

$$\mathcal{R}_m = \bigcup_{i=r_n-L}^{r_n} C_{m,i} \text{ and } \mathcal{L}_m = C_m \setminus \mathcal{R}_m.$$

Define $A = I_1 \times \cdots \times I_1$ and $B = [I_1 \times \ldots I_1 \times I_2] \setminus [\bigcup_{m=n}^{\infty}(\mathcal{R}_m \times \cdots \times \mathcal{R}_m)$. Thus

$$\mu^k(B) = [\prod_{m=n}^{\infty}(1 - (\frac{L}{r_m})^k)]\mu(I_1)^k \geq (1 - \sum_{m=n}^{\infty}(\frac{L}{r_m})^k))\mu(I_1)^k > 0.$$

We will prove inductively on m that

$$\mu^k(T_k^i A \cap B) = 0$$

for $-h_m \leq i \leq h_m$. Since A and B are disjoint and each is a product of levels from C_n, then $\mu^k(T_k^i A \cap B) = 0$ for $-h_n \leq i \leq h_n$. Now suppose $\mu^k(T_k^i A \cap B) = 0$ for $-h_m \leq i \leq h_m$.

Consider the four intersections: $T^i\mathcal{L}_m \cap \mathcal{L}_m$, $T^i\mathcal{L}_m \cap \mathcal{R}_m$, $T^i\mathcal{R}_m \cap \mathcal{L}_m$, and $T^i\mathcal{R}_m \cap \mathcal{R}_m$.

First $\mu(T^i\mathcal{R}_m \cap \mathcal{L}_m) = 0$ for $h_m \leq i \leq h_{m+1}$.

Second if $\mu(T^i\mathcal{R}_m \cap \mathcal{R}_m) > 0$ then $\mu(T^i\mathcal{L}_m \cap C_m) = 0$ for $h_m \leq i \leq h_{m+1}$. Since $B \cap (\mathcal{R}_m \times \cdots \times \mathcal{R}_m) = \emptyset$, we need only consider the intersections: $T^i\mathcal{L}_m \cap \mathcal{L}_m$ and $T^i\mathcal{L}_m \cap \mathcal{R}_m$.

Suppose $\mu(T^i\mathcal{L}_m \cap \mathcal{R}_m) > 0$. If $\mu(T^i\mathcal{L}_m \cap (\mathcal{R}_m \setminus C_{m,r_n-L+1})) > 0$ then $\mu(T^i\mathcal{L}_m \cap \mathcal{L}_m) = 0$. Since $B \cap (\mathcal{R}_m \times \cdots \times \mathcal{R}_m) = \emptyset$, we may assume $\mu(T^i\mathcal{L}_m \cap (\mathcal{R}_m \setminus C_{m,r_n-L+1})) = 0$.

Finally consider the case $\mu(T^i\mathcal{L}_m \cap (\mathcal{L}_m \cup C_{m,r_n-L+1})) > 0$. For $j \leq r_n - L$ and for $p \geq j$, $T^i C_{m,j-1}$ overlaps the same number of levels

in $C_{m,p-1}$ as $T^i C_{m,j}$ overlaps in $C_{m,p}$. Hence this scenario reduces to the case $-h_m \leq i \leq h_m$. Therefore $\mu(T_k^i A \cap B) = 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq h_{m+1}$. The case $-h_{m+1} \leq i$ can be handled in a similar manner. □

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Nat Friedman for discussions at the early stages of this work. We thank James Wilcox for typesetting our figure in tikz.

References

[AFS97] Terrence Adams, Nathaniel Friedman, and Cesar E. Silva, *Rank-one weak mixing for nonsingular transformations*, Israel J. Math. **102** (1997), 269–281. MR 1489108 (98j:28013)

[AFS01] ———, *Rank-one power weakly mixing non-singular transformations*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **21** (2001), no. 5, 1321–1332. MR 1855834 (2002h:37013)

[ALW79] Jonathan Aaronson, Michael Lin, and Benjamin Weiss, *Mixing properties of Markov operators and ergodic transformations, and ergodicity of Cartesian products*, Israel J. Math. **33** (1979), no. 3-4, 198–224 (1980), A collection of invited papers on ergodic theory. MR 571530 (81i:47010a)

[Dan08] Alexandre I. Danilenko, *(C, F)-actions in ergodic theory*, Geometry and dynamics of groups and spaces, Progr. Math., vol. 265, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2008, pp. 325–351. MR 2402408 (2009g:37003)

[DGMS99] Sarah L. Day, Brian R. Grivna, Earle P. McCartney, and Cesar E. Silva, *Power weakly mixing infinite transformations*, New York J. Math. **5** (1999), 17–24 (electronic). MR 1679635 (2000m:28016)

[DP11] Alexandre I. Danilenko and Kyewon K. Park, *Rank-one flows of transformations with infinite ergodic index*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **139** (2011), no. 1, 201–207. MR 2729083 (2011m:37007)

[DS09] Alexandre I. Danilenko and Cesar E. Silva, *Ergodic theory: Nonsingular transformations*, Encyclopedia of Complexity and System Science, vol. Part 5, Springer, 2009, pp. 3055–3083.

[Fri83] Nathaniel A. Friedman, *Mixing on sequences*, Canad. J. Math. **35** (1983), no. 2, 339–352. MR 695088 (85a:28011)

[IKS+05] Sarah Iams, Brian Katz, Cesar E. Silva, Brian Street, and Kirsten Wickelgren, *On weakly mixing and doubly ergodic nonsingular actions*, Colloq. Math. **103** (2005), no. 2, 247–264. MR 2197854 (2007a:37006)

[JA13] Aimee S.A. Johnson and Ayse A., *Directional recurrence for infinite measure preserving F^d actions*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1306.4357 (2013).

[KP63] S. Kakutani and W. Parry, *Infinite measure preserving transformations with "mixing"*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **69** (1963), 752–756. MR 0153815 (27 #3776)

9161 Sterling Dr., Department of Defense, Laurel, MD 20723
E-mail address: tmadam2@tycho.ncsc.mil

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Williams College, Williamstown, MA 01267
E-mail address: csilva@williams.edu